	Case 3:07-cv-02911-SI Document 8	Filed 06/21/2007 Page 1 of 3		
1	LINCEL II WINTERS ESO (SDN 27750)			
2	LINGEL H. WINTERS, ESQ. (SBN 37759) LAW OFFICES OF LINGEL H. WINTERS			
3	A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION One Maritime Plaza, Suite 400			
4	San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: (415) 398-2941			
5	Facsimile: (415) 393-9887			
	GIRARDI & KEESE			
6	THOMAS V. GIRARDI (SBN 36603) 1126 Wilshire Blvd.			
7	Los Angeles, CA 90017-1904			
8	Telephone (213) 977-0211			
9	Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Putative Class			
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
11	NORTHERN DISTR	ICT OF CALIFORNIA		
12				
		MDI N. M.07 01027 CI		
13	IN RE TFT-LCD (FLAT	MDL No. M:07-cv-01827 SI		
14	PANEL)ANTITRUST LITIGATION	Case No. C-07-cv-2796 SI		
15		CLASS ACTION		
16 17	EMW, Inc. v. LG Philips LCD CO., LTD et al. Case No. C-07-2796 SI	MOTION FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME		
	THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO	Date: July 10, 2007		
18	ALL INDIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS	Time: 10:00 a.m.		
19		Hon. Susan Illston Courtroom: 10		
20				
21				
22				
23	Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-3, plaintiff and moving party EMW, Inc. moves the Court for an			
24	order shortening time to hear plaintiff's Motion To Appoint Interim Class Counsel For the			
25	California Indirect Purchasers Subgroup.			
26	On June 4, 2007, plaintiff EMW, Inc. filed its Reply Memorandum Indirect Purchaser			
27	Leadership Proposal of Lingel H. Winters P.C.	in the belief that the hearing on various class		
28				
•				
	1 MOTION FOR ORDER SHORTING TIME			
l	INIOTION FOR ORDER SHORTING TIME			

13

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

motions was firmly set for June 8, 2007 and that there was no further time in which to take action. On June 5, 2007, the Court continued the motions to July 10, 2007. With this continuance in hand, plaintiff undertook to engage co-counsel to join in filing its Motion To Appoint Interim Class Counsel For the California Indirect Purchasers Subgroup. On June 18, Thomas V. Girardi of Girardi & Keese agreed to join as co-counsel and plaintiff set about finalizing said Motion. It is believed that said Motion will simplify the case and increase the manageability and judicial economy for the case, and that therefore, it is in the interest of all parties and the Court for said Motion to be heard on July 10, 2007.

Substantial harm or prejudice will occur if the time for hearing the motion is not shortened in several regards:

- 1) The Court and putative classes will be deprived of the appropriate competition among law firms for service to them.
- 2) The manageability of the indirect purchasers action may be adversely affected by consolidated representation of claimants claiming under the laws of 20-30 different states. The Motion contends that manageability and commonality can only be achieved by subgrouping the various claims.

Some counsel claim that claimants claiming under the differing laws of 20-30 states may be represented by one consolidated group of attorneys. Plaintiff contends that such representation could undermine commonality and predominance and lead to conflicts. Plaintiff contends that there is a natural subgrouping that arises from the complaint in Eliasoph v. LG Philips Co, Ltd. et al., breaks the claimants down into three natural groups:

- 1) Subgroup One: California Claims (*Eliasoph* Second, Third Claims)
  - 2) SubGroup Two: Claims under Other Repealer States with laws involving "Violations of State Antitrust and Unfair Competition

·			
1	Laws" – Eliasoph Fourth Claim)		
2	3) Subgroup Three: Claims under State laws claimed as "Violations of		
3	State Consumer Protection and Unfair Competition Laws – <i>Eliasoph</i>		
4	Fifth Claim.		
5	In such cases as <i>Walsh v. Ford Motor Co.</i> (D.C. Cir. 1986) 807 F.2d 1000, 1017 and <i>In Re</i>		
6	School Asbestos Litigation 789 F.2d 996 (3 <sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1986), the Courts concluded various and		
7 8			
9	differing state claims may satisfy the predominance and commonality requirement where		
10	subgrouping of such State claims in employed.		
11	The Motion also contends that such subgrouping minimizes conflicts.		
12	Since multiple parties are involved in this complex action, the best notice is by ECF and it		
13	would be impractical to seek stipulation.		
14	WHEFORE plaintiff prays for an Order Shortening Time for plaintiff's Motion to Appoint		
15	Interim Class Counsel For the California Indirect Purchasers Subgroup.		
16			
17	Dated: June 21, 2007 LAW OFFICES OF LINGEL H. WINTERS		
18	A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION		
19	Jan Dyl houte	-	
20	By. Lingel H. Winters		
21 22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			